



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

partizan life of Luther. No one who did not sympathize with the Christian point of view could understand the fundamental traits of Luther's character as the author does, but no Roman Catholic who knew this book was written by a Protestant, could find in it anything unfair or apt to hurt his feelings.

The reviewer would have liked the book even better if an occasional tag of comment—two or three lines intended to suggest to the reader what he ought to think about the facts just narrated—had been stricken out in the proof-reading, but these little tags of comment, though superfluous, are generally judicious. A good many people might write of Luther's conduct during the Peasants' Revolt out of a mood less inclined to excuse passionate words sure to increase bloodshed than the author; but that is a matter of judgment. On one point, however, there is, to the reviewer's mind, a little unconscious special pleading: in regard to the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse. If Philip "duped" (p. 367) Luther, Luther was willing to play a worse trick on the woman in the case. He fell before the temptation Satan put before Christ when he offered Him the kingdoms of the world—the temptation to help a sacred cause to prevail by an act of evil. The stain on Luther's character, of course, lies not in the fact that he once honestly consented to bigamy in a particular instance, but that he lied about it and was willing to deceive a woman who trusted in his judgment.

The style is strong and pleasant; a slight tendency to "preciousness" which shows in the first three chapters fortunately disappears in the rest of the volume.

Every reader will like the book and the trained historian will justify his liking. It is especially good because it shows the continuous play of Luther's humor, for no great man had that softening gift in larger measure. It makes plain Luther's superhuman energy, his limitless courage, the depth and strength of his religious feeling. The reviewer does not know in any language a better and sounder small popular sketch of that man of titanic mold and coarse fibre. To give to those who read only English such a new opportunity to know one of the three greatest men whose interest has centred on the teaching of Christ, is to do a great service for history; for if there ever was a time when those who can interpret the results of historical scholarship to the world were needed, it is now.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

*La Révolution.* Par LOUIS MADELIN. [L'Histoire de France racontée à Tous.] (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1911. Pp. vii, 578.)

THIS volume on the Revolution was written for the general reader and is probably the best volume of the kind extant. It covers the period from 1789—the elections to the States General—to 1799, the establishment of the Consulate. These limits were set for it by the fact that it

formed one volume of a series, the preceding volume going to 1789 and the succeeding volume dealing with the Empire. Within these limits, the matter is well distributed, the proportions good, and the parts well bound together. A recent review characterizes the book as "tres spirituel" and adds that "les gens du monde, auquel il semble surtout destiné, le liront sans fatigue et avec profit". "Spirituel" it certainly is, at times, it seemed to me, "trop spirituel", losing sight of the fact that the historian should always take his work seriously and that his exposition falls short of the best attainable, if it lacks dignity. It is a "readable" book, but all parts of it will not be "read with profit". Not only does one encounter numerous incorrect statements of details, but the *ensembles* not infrequently fail to reproduce correctly the course of events. There is no cause for surprise in this. The history of the Revolution must still be constructed largely from the sources, very few reliable monographs having yet been written upon it. The latter half of M. Madelin's volume is better than the first half, for there he is on ground made more familiar by his volume on Fouché and his study of the diplomatic relations between France and Pius VI. He has depended largely upon the work of others—not wholly as he states in his preface—and not infrequently he has misplaced his confidence. The confidence in the critical soundness of his work is not increased by his frank confession that his admiration for Taine—after Aulard's destructive criticism—"reste entière". So far as he does use sources, he prefers letters to memoirs. The brief bibliographies at the close of each chapter contain good material, although there are some rather surprising omissions and the form is very bad. It is not to be expected that in a volume for general readers German works—in German—would find a place, but it is to be expected that the historian has read them. Such assumption would not, I am inclined to believe, be true in the case of M. Madelin. Had he read, for example, the monographs of Clapham and Glagau on the origin of the war of 1792, the narrative would have approached much nearer to a true representation of the causes of that war. His treatment of the topic is extremely superficial and cannot possibly convey a correct idea of the situation to the uninitiated. His whole treatment of the period of the Constituent Assembly is unsatisfactory because of his failure to lay due stress upon the work of the reactionary forces. Even when he speaks source in hand, it is well to read the source before accepting his interpretation of it. One of the most astonishing illustrations of his inaccuracy is found (p. 62) in his statement concerning the formation of the citizen guard in Paris in July 1789. "Dès le 25 juin", he writes, "les électeurs de l'Hôtel de Ville avaient décidé de former une milice bourgeoise, la future garde nationale, *non point du tout, comme l'ont cru, cent ans, tant d'historiens et la foule de leurs lecteurs, contre la Cour, mais contre les brigands* [the italics are M. Madelin's] *que—les procès-verbaux des électeurs en font foi—on redoutait avant tout.*" That would seem to be trustworthy, but what

does the *procès-verbal* show? In the first place that nothing of the kind was passed on June 25 and in the second place that the motion made to form a citizen guard proposed simply that the National Assembly be asked to sanction the wish of the electors of Paris "pour rétablir la Garde Bourgeoise" and gave no reason whatever for such action. Other evidence, however, shows conclusively that Paris was arming itself against the anticipated royal *coup d'état*. M. Madelin had Sorel for a master, so he tells us. He inherits the defect of his master; his text is more "spirituel" than exact.

FRED MORROW FLING.

*Napoléon I<sup>er</sup> et le Monopole Universitaire.* Par A. AULARD, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1911. Pp. ix, 385.)

SOME of the expressions in Professor Aulard's preface might arouse the suspicion that this volume, if not suggested by existing problems in France, has probably been at least hastened thereby. Not that it is marked by *parti pris*, for indeed it is notably moderate and judicious. But it is for the most part in advance of M. Aulard's profound and steadily progressing study of the great period of reconstruction, and the author himself would probably be the first to admit (as in many places indeed he does admit) that research in the field has not yet proceeded far enough to make possible a conclusive treatment especially in a volume of this brevity. It is a fair (and discouraging) indication of the condition of the study of Napoleonic institutions that one is led to this conclusion in a field that has probably been more debated than any other except the closely allied one of the Church. And as the explanation lies no doubt in this significant word *debated*, it should be taken as an encouraging circumstance that though M. Aulard has in the past been found not infrequently in the ranks of these debaters, this his latest study shows but slight trace of this attitude.

The author is obliged by the brevity of his work to confine himself to a rather insufficient presentation of the conditions which the Napoleonic educational establishments were designed to amend. The Napoleonic system itself is studied with care, though it would appear (from material in the possession of the reviewer) that on some points (as statistics) a closer examination of the archives would enable more definite statements to be made. So far as general conclusions are presented they may be said to be favorable to the Napoleonic educational policy; M. Aulard announces a revision of his earlier conviction that that policy was reactionary, and he dwells with considerable emphasis on the position that in point of fact there was no "monopole universitaire", since the determination to really apply one was reached by Napoleon only in 1811 and since the application of it was then frustrated by Fontanes. This latter position (as to Fontanes) is of course not